



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE MEANING OF SOCIAL WORK.*

THE movement which has brought us together to-day may be regarded as a positive stage in the effort of a national mind to organize itself. The educational institutions of Wales are the envy of the educationist in England. He sees in them the realized conception—the living machinery—which focuses the life of the people into an intelligence that all may share. Such an organized intelligence, a popular mind, supported by a duly graded system of schools and colleges, and a University, in touch with the life of the people, is an enormous social force. Strictly speaking, if it could fulfil its conception by assimilating into its own tissue all the wants and impulses of the population, it would be the entire and the only social force.

It is not surprising that those who are immediately connected with the centres of this great social force should to-day be turning their attention systematically to social work. It is an inevitable movement of the public mind, which may be compared with what is constantly happening in private life. Men of literary or academic pursuits may be brought by one cause or another to devote their attention to the management of a household and the social needs and duties of a neighborhood, among rich and poor. When this happens they have a two-fold experience. They feel, no doubt, that in as far as they master the situation, life becomes more interesting, and, so to speak, more securely founded, than it was before. They feel that they know where they are, in a way which is new to them. Their neighborhood and even their household become to them a drama of living and human characters, no longer a background of mechanical and mysterious agencies. They feel themselves at home in the foundations and surroundings of their life, instead of floating in the community, as it were, on an unknown sea. That is one side of the matter.

But there is another side to it, and it is this. They find that they have a great deal to learn, and a good deal probably

*An address delivered to the Association of Past Students of the University College, Cardiff, on January 4, 1901.

to unlearn. They have to train themselves in seeing and feeling social forces which they have hitherto known, if at all, mainly by reading and reflection. They have to understand what subtle problems are hidden under the apparently simple routine of the peasant's or workman's life. They have to unlearn many of their notions as to what influences are good, and what are bad, in a neighborhood, and to realize that to introduce reforms into a district may need as much hard thinking as to remodel a scientific theory, and much more patience, courage and tact.

It is much the same, on a larger scale, when the national mind is roused to apply itself to social work. And it is for this reason that I ventured to ask you to-day to consider with me the meaning, the significance, or purport, of what is commonly known by that name.

Of course, work may be social work in a single or in a double sense. It may be social in its aim only, as in the case of efforts to make the higher literary and scientific education the common possession of the people. It was this, I think, that was mainly present to Mr. Owen in his presidential address to this association. Again, work may be social not only as aiming at the ultimate benefit and elevation of society, but as occupying itself more especially with subjects which concern the structure and function of the community, and with the immediate relations between the classes of which society is made up. Much may be said, very much indeed, in favor of directing the work of such an association as your own mainly on the lines which Mr. Owen has prefigured. The present address, however, presupposes that a doubly social work is in some degree before the members' minds, and it is intended to explain what the serious undertaking of such a work should involve. I shall be well contented if thus much only is effected by these suggestions, that the members of the association become perfectly clear in their own minds what course they intend to adopt, and by what means they intend to pursue it. I only trust that if they propose to deal with social subjects and relations, they will count the cost and adopt the highest standard of work.

In the deepest sense, then, it may be, all work is directly or

indirectly social; but, important as this truth is, we will not dwell on it just now. Social work is to-day commonly interpreted in contrast with industrial or professional work. It is what we have spoken of as doubly social work. The "Worker" is one thing, and the workman is another. "Women Workers," in the title of the National Union of Women Workers, means something quite different from "working women." Social work is thought of as something spontaneous, human, sociable; an effort to gain direct contact with the human nature of those around us. In it we devote to others not our peculiar acquired skill, but ourselves, our heart and soul. Perhaps the attractiveness of social work partly consists in the escape from our particular groove,

"So to be the man, and leave the artist,
Gain the man's joy, miss the artist's sorrow."

It involves, indeed, like the return to Nature of which we hear so much, a refreshment and reinforcement of our intellectual life; the return to Nature is a great idea, but the return to Man is perhaps a greater. We are often reminded how Plato proposed that philosophers should be kings—*i. e.*, that power to influence society should be confined to those who are endowed with the true student spirit; but it is less often brought to our notice that the same passage is decisive for excluding from the ranks of genuine students all who are indifferent to social work.

So, then, our doubly social work, however human and spontaneous, dealing however directly with persons and class-relations, is not to be set in contrast with the spirit of the true student. It too has an aspect of being an art and science; a clear purpose with a reasonable method. There is nothing in this against the strength and freshness of human feeling which it embodies. We are not to make our social work victim of the foolish opposition between heart and head. It is impossible to utter profound and serious feeling except by the instrumentality of thorough brain work. A great drama or a great piece of music show us both feeling and intelligence at their highest pitch, and each of them at a pitch which can be attained solely by their fusion, and in no other way whatever.

Thus we are prepared for the question Plato asks even about

morality, and which he certainly would have asked us about Social Work.

I know what you mean, he says in effect, by the art or science of medicine; it is that which gives appropriate drugs and diet to people who are ill; and I know what you mean by the art and science of cookery; it is that which applies proper preparation to the food we eat; but now, what, he would ask, what is the art or science of social work; what things or principles does it make use of, and to what things or persons does it apply them?

Or again he might have extended to it a remark he is fond of urging about statesmanship, which ought, I suppose, to be social work in its highest form. It is a curious thing, he loves to point out—if we may paraphrase him in modern terms—that in every other art or science or industry a man who practices it can say where he was apprentice or undergraduate, and who was his teacher, and when he obtained his degree or passed Master of the Art; but in statesmanship alone of all arts and industries there is no such qualification; no apprenticeship, no undergraduate career, no degree and no Mastership of the Art. Perhaps this is in spirit not absolutely true of all statesmanship to-day; but it is still true enough to be exceedingly suggestive. And of social work it is terribly true. If we ask how many people doing social work have really been trained, and how many places there are where they can get any methodical training, the answer, I think, would make us open our eyes. When the reserves or irregular forces of social workers have to be called upon for a bit of real extra duty, as was the case in connection with the relief funds made necessary by the war, a most extraordinary spectacle of absolute helplessness is revealed.

Now it seems to me pretty certain that many of those who are here to-day will be asking themselves what all this has to do with the simple matters in which at present they intend to find their social work; workmen's clubs, I have been told, perhaps boys' and girls' clubs, and some simple functions in connection with a C. O. S. Surely one may help in an entertainment, or take part in a club to keep young folks out of the

streets in the evening, or take round an allowance to an old woman, without having, so to speak, passed an examination in social objects and methods. Is it not a little pedantic to set the standard so high for every social worker? Well, there are two things to think of. First, you will always spread the spirit which you are of. I don't mean to say you need a system of social theory and practice to go and sing a song at an entertainment. The smaller your point of contact is the less harm you can do and the less good. Though if you come to that, I do remember a thorough musician, well skilled himself in managing concerts for the working class, who said to me, "When a music-hall artist sings a vulgar song at a music hall, we know he has his living to make, and we pardon him; but when a volunteer gives vulgar stuff at a people's concert, he does it out of the sheer unnecessary iniquity of his heart, and it is" and the sentence ended in strong language. But this is an extreme case, no doubt. I only wanted to show that really it always matters what sort of thing you do. In the general life of a workman's club, however, or in that of a boys' and girls' club, the sort of thing you have in your mind about the working class must make just all the difference. They must see where your heart is and where your hopes lie for society; when you come to talk, and, among the young folks, to give advice, your ideas must permeate and spread, or your want of ideas produce a deadening effect. But in the second place you have to remember that *things will happen*. You won't be let alone. You will have to act, to help, to manage. Your friends will fall into trouble, perhaps get into trouble. Crises and emergencies will arise in their lives, especially with respect to the choice of industries for the young, or how they are to spend their money. Your club and its influence may set them just straight or just crooked for a lifetime. I need not speak of what C. O. S. work involves; I shall have to recur to that below.

So far I am only trying to make the point that "social work," like everything we do which is to be of any service, demands that we shall know our own minds; that we should know what we mean by it, and act consistently and with purpose.

Now we will try to come closer, and see what sort of purpose is implied in social work. Social workers take many different lines, but they mostly come back to these two: they want to brighten the lives of the people, or to improve the conditions in which they live. If you follow up these clues they will bring you to the same centre. Brightening their lives, when you work it out, means making them happier; and happiness, of course, means the mind or disposition which makes the most of life. Improving the conditions in which they live, if you work it out, means changing matters in such a way that those concerned become able to make more of their lives than they did before; and this again means, so that their character may be able to master their circumstances.

The final test and purpose, then, is mind or character. This is so, simply because every other test or clue leads you back to this one. It is the only point of view which includes everything in life. This does not mean that circumstances, houses, and wages, and such things, are unimportant. But it does mean that they are unimportant except in their relation to mind and character, and because of this it is only mind and character that can either make them contribute to happiness or secure them with certainty. I know this sounds like moralizing. But it is not spoken in that sense, and it is the conclusion to which sociology has slowly and inevitably, and with much reluctance, been driven, and which social philosophy has upheld from its inception. Every social fact, when you pursue it with a view to complete explanation, leads you up to a mind, because this is the only central point of view. The official statistician tells us that drunkenness has been rising for the past five years, and that this "is due to the prosperity of the country." Ruskin, in his wildest mood, never said anything more humorous. Obviously, we have had so to speak more circumstances than our character could control. Again, all passenger-traffic returns in France are lower on Fridays. Why? In order to give the answer you must find out why people in France dislike traveling on Friday. In this way every fact comes alive in your hands, and is unexplained till you have referred it to the one centre of life.

Here, then seems to be the true meaning of social work. Wherever it may start, its goal is the same: to bring the social mind into order, into harmony with itself. Social disorganization is the outward and visible form of moral and intellectual disorganization. This does not involve saying that it can only be combated by directly moral and intellectual means; but it does involve saying that it can only be combated by means, which, *all things considered* (this is really the important point) make for moral and intellectual ends. And it therefore involves saying that any who undertake to combat social disorganization will certainly increase and not diminish it unless they clearly apprehend the moral and intellectual purpose of their work, and the relation of the means which they employ to this purpose.

The great question of principle affecting social work, on which the social order now reflects the disorganization of the social mind, seems to be this: Does our social idea imply the perpetuation of dependent poverty, or the extirpation of it? In other words, are "The Poor," as a dependent class, as you have them in the church offertory, an element of our working social conception? Until we are clear on this point, our social work will always be aimless, and therefore a hotbed of abuses. We shall never know whether we are working literally for the *support of poverty*, or on the other hand for the improvement of the condition of the poor. It is important to realize how deep-rooted in the English mind is the notion of a sort of tithe or benevolence, a contribution to the sustentation of poverty, as a good thing in itself; it is a point in which the social mind seems to be wholly at loose ends, or rather to inherit a terribly false and powerful tradition, and not in any way to be knit up into a purpose or unity. The first thing is then to be clear in our own minds what we really want and are working for, and further, I would say, to be clear as to the frightful evil caused by the mere fact of aimlessness in social work.

We may illustrate this point, the evils of aimlessness, by the confusion which prevail in the out-department system of the hospitals in London at the present day. I think it would be true to say that no sane man with the facts under his eyes

could purposely give his money to support such a system or non-system as that which has grown up, by which the hospital staff are overstrained, the patients ill-attended to, and the general practitioners in a fair way to be ruined. Nobody wants it who is directly concerned; the hospital doctors don't want it, the patients don't want it, the medical profession are largely against it. It goes on because the public mind is not on this subject in the condition of a plain sane man with a clear purpose before him. So far from demanding a better system, the public would very probably withdraw support from any hospital which should relax in the present system—the suicidal competition for work which it cannot do and which others could live by doing. A similar evil is the true ground of objection to raising money by bazaars and entertainments for benevolent purposes. The very point of this practice is to get people to contribute their money whose interest in the purpose to be attained is insufficient to make them contribute. The result is that the rational connection between interest and purpose is broken; support of an institution ceases to have any connection with understanding or approval of its aims. Frequently, of course, the entertainment is projected for its own sake, and an institution is subsequently hunted up to serve as a pretext for it. What is wanted, a true democratic basis of work, is the precise contrary of this. It is that the support accorded to institutions should be a definite reflection of an intelligent interest and purpose entertained by the public mind, so that the supporters of an institution should always be pressing it towards its right and specific function, as much as the shareholders of a company press it to pay a dividend. We only want subscribers to care as much for the efficiency of a benevolent institution as shareholders do for that of a joint-stock company; and, in general, that social work shall be managed as intelligently as business or industry.

Now to grasp the full significance of social work, conceived as applying the idea of purpose and character in the sphere of our voluntary relations with others, needs a special training. And here I must propound a heresy. I cannot think that the material for such a training is to be found in economic

science, as it at present stands, judging by its leading textbooks, and favorite methods of research. Individual students of economics have probably done and discovered more than has as yet passed into the body of the science. And I think they would probably agree with me, that when we look to political economy for a recognition of the central social forces, on which the social worker has really and practically to rely, we shall find comparatively little to help us. The idea of society as an embodied mind and character, on which recent sociology lays stress, and which the experience of social workers had long previously established, seems to be approached by economic science so timidly as to give little guidance to the practical man. One might take as a text in this matter the work of Chalmers in his Glasgow parish, the memory of which has been revived by a recent publication.* I do not know, and I should be only too glad to be corrected, that any economist has disengaged from fallacies and controversies belonging to the time the central significance of that wonderful achievement, and of the views upon which it was founded. It is true that Chalmers was opposing in Scotland the introduction of a compulsory poor-rate, and that the existence of such a rate and of the Poor Law was even in his time in England a settled system of long standing. So the very ground on which he stood may seem to be cut away. But this has not much to do with the remarkable significance of his work. His central principle was in essence that of democracy. I know well, of course, that many of his views, reflecting those of his time, could be urged on the other side. His principle in social work was, however, I repeat, that of democracy. The "sufficiency of the people" was his watchword. This is grossly misconstrued if it is taken to mean that a respectable man can usually find work and support himself. What it meant was rather this: A community of the people is a living mind. It has its affections, its duties, its obligations, its foresight, its pride and its delicacy—his constant reiteration of the term delicacy is a striking proof of his insight. It has its own innate strength, its own variety, its own recuperative power. If you wish to help it to make the

*Chalmers on Charity; Masterman, Constable & Co.

most of itself, you must understand it, sympathize with it, and meet it on the right path. You must not thrust in the iron hand of the unskilled social worker, tearing to pieces the delicate living tissues of filial and parental obligation, of neighborly kindness and of the standard of right conduct, foresight and honesty. "It was the people who did it," he would reiterate, in reference to his administration of the poorest parish in Glasgow for four years, through exceptional hardship, without a poor-rate, and without external aid. "It was not we who did it; it was the people who did it." This seems to me the very core of true democracy. The people felt that they were understood, and met halfway, and their life put forth its strength. Only a democratic church, perhaps, could use Chalmers' method with the fullest effect; but the essence of his principle is a permanent gain to the economics of social work; the only serious advance, it might almost be said, since Aristotle. The sufficiency of the people is a social force measurable in the crudest way by enormous sums of money. It is measurable also, and most remarkably, by the incredulity of critics confronted with the results achieved. An immense financial result is attained, for which to the average critic there is simply no cause. Their efforts to explain it are amusing. "Chalmers," they said, "had private command of large sums of money." He answered that he had not a penny beyond the small collections whose amount was publicly stated, "the half-pence of the poor." "But his deacons were rich men, and gave surreptitiously out of their own pockets." Two of them did, once or twice, and almost broke down the system by the resulting disorder. As a rule they were quite poor men, and these succeeded best. "Chalmers starved the poor and drove them out of the parish." He counted heads, and found the truth to be that the poor came into the parish; the system, in fact, was popular. "Chalmers was such a wonderful man." This argument made him furious. It was, he thought, as if you said that the fact of the circulation of the blood depended upon Harvey being such a wonderful man. Anything rather than believe that you have hitherto been blind to a simple necessary truth! And this controversy is always repeated, in all its

phases, whenever this simple truth has again been successfully relied on; notably in the Bradfield case, almost word for word, where the question was one of restricting out-relief. This could not continue to happen, if recognized teachers and text-books really grasped the point that the sufficiency of the people, the fabric of mind and character in a coherent society, is an economic force of the first order; and that by ceasing from piecemeal interference with it you are not transferring a pecuniary burden from stronger to weaker shoulders, but are releasing a power of growth which your interference alone has held back.

Here, again, is a very simple instance in a small compass of the way in which mind and character are central facts, and because central facts are in practice unique forces. I allude to the case of underfed school children. It is plain that an ill-fed child is not fit to be taught in school. It is plain, too, that a meal given to an ill-fed child so far makes him better fed. And to many this simple physical relation seems conclusive. Food nourishes, nourishment is desirable, therefore feeding is desirable. But omitting the probability of malnutrition from other causes than lack of food, still a factor is overlooked. In dealing with the body of the child you can affect one, two or perhaps three meals in the week. But at the same time you are doing something else—you are dealing with the mind of the parent. Now the mind of the parent is the force to which the child must look for all his meals in the week, and all his home surroundings and prospects in life. The least relaxation in the sense of responsibility in the parent's mind very much more than cancels the nourishment given by one or two meals a week to the child's body. People start a feeding scheme, and then observe to their surprise that there is no change to speak of in the children's appearance. And this is the explanation. Not with any wicked intention, but naturally enough accepting the situation, the parents have just slacked off at their end of the rope as much as the feeders have tightened up at theirs. If you want to do any real good, you must go to the parents and find out what is wrong, whether they can't or won't feed their child properly; you must consider the

family life from their point of view, and see if it cannot be put upon a better footing. Then you take the strong, central point of view, affecting all the child's meals and health and prospects, and not merely the bit by bit point of view affecting one or two meals a week. This is a very simple instance of the two points of view which may be called respectively that of circumstance and that of character. Character is a name for life as it looks, when you take it as all connected together; circumstance is a name for life as it looks when you take it just bit by bit. The action of character, compared with that of circumstance, is like a process of multiplication compared with one of simple addition. It does not deal with different things; that is a mistake of principle; it deals with the same things, but by a complete method, instead of an incomplete one.

The current economic training, then, it is my heresy to suggest, will not take you far in understanding the deeper forces with which social work will bring you into contact. If so, where are you to get your training?

In the main, I feel pretty sure, you will have to create it for yourselves. It is a magnificent opportunity, worthy of a country which has so perfectly organized its educational institutions. There is indeed a very inadequate but steadily increasing literature of the subject. A central library and smaller dispersed libraries of this literature would be a necessary auxiliary to the training. There are also a few institutions where such training is methodically carried on. I could mention a University settlement and, so far as I know, only one in the world, where a student can be directed in a regular course of social work on its various sides and branches, practical and theoretical, the theory being such as has grown out of practice, and is inseparably interwoven with it. There is also, as I am more especially bound to remember, a Committee in London which exists for the purpose of providing courses of lectures, whether in or out of London, on practice and practical theory, with regard to any special type of work, for intending social workers. And there are the various Charity Organization Societies; your own here in Cardiff, and the old Society in London, which is always ready and eager to give

any help either by advice out of its now lengthening experience, or by receiving volunteers to train in its offices, which is by far the best practical plan. All these institutions, with their literature, their daily practice, or their lectures, would be available to you for help and for suggestion. But there is no question that to a great extent the educational apparatus of the subject has yet to be created, and a generation of competent teachers has yet to appear. I do most earnestly hope and entreat that if anything should seem paradoxical or unconvincing in what I have been saying to-day, you will not for that reason fail to make trial of the conception that social work demands and will repay a special and serious study and training. Every special point of view demands a special training. Familiarity with certain phenomena apart from a special point of view is useless for the purpose to which that point of view refers. For example, it is often maintained that the working class know most about the Poor Law, though they have the least influence in its administration. But this is not true. They have not been led to study the Poor Law as a force affecting society as a whole; and apart from such study mere contact cannot be said to confer knowledge. Happily, moreover, the solid working class does not much rub shoulders with the Poor Law. With genuine knowledge they might indeed *become* the completest experts, but that is a question for the future.

A great opportunity is before you. You are here in the forefront of popular education; you are also, as all of you are no doubt aware, in the forefront of something else. No part of England or Wales indeed can compete with my own native county of Northumberland in the number of persons charged with drunkenness; but in referring to the latest criminal statistics* for another purpose I could not but notice the position both in drunkenness and in general crime occupied by Monmouth and Glamorgan. I have not the local knowledge which would enable me to get behind these figures, which might even mean in part the activity of your police; but whatever reservations may have to be made it seems clear that in

*For 1898, published 1900.

the immediate surrounding district you have very grave evils to contend with. To make paler the patches which represent these countries on the maps of crime distribution would surely be a noble ambition, and ought not to be beyond the influence and intelligence of such a body as that which I am addressing. Much, for example, is being attempted elsewhere in public management of the drink traffic. Could not some well-concocted experiment be initiated here?

I have reserved for my conclusion a few words about the typical example of what is meant by organization of the social mind, in the work of a Charity Organization Society. The duty of such a society, as I understand it, is by no means to grasp at power, or at exclusive control, but to take a stand for definiteness of plan and purpose, and endeavor to promote them throughout all the social work, both public and private, of the neighborhood; to organize, in a word, the mind of the district about social work.

First of all in importance comes the administration of the Poor Law. Unless the Poor Law Guardians are brought to adopt an intelligent division of labor with the other social workers of the district, the C. O. S. has made, and can make, but little progress in its task. The study of Poor Law history, experience, and practice, is at the root of all rational organization in the charity of a district.

Next comes the attitude of the ministers of religion. It is a question, I repeat, of ideas and not of interference. Are they, whether of their own motion or through the influence of the C. O. S., in the habit of dealing with charity from the point of view of a definite purpose, and a conception of eradicating and not of perpetuating the dependence of the poor? What are the parochial charities about, and, if any, the endowed charities of the entire district? Has the C. O. S. "charted" the district, and formed for itself a definite conception of the way in which all its agencies should coöperate for the good of the whole? I may say that for all social workers to "chart" the district in this sense is an excellent beginning. Do the trustees of charities take the advice of the C. O. S., or act on their own motion as if they had taken it? Are old age pen-

sions, for example, in cases of need which the parties could not provide against, organized by contributions of relatives, and others who are responsible, supplemented where needful from parochial and other charities? Here is the old-age pension scheme, unknown to statesmen, but practicable, already largely in work, and almost easy. Is the C. O. S. fulfilling its true function of utilizing for every case of helpable distress the contributions of the persons and institutions primarily under obligation, and has it largely banished aimlessness from private charity, or is it adding to the disorganization of the district by collecting a general relief fund in addition to existing agencies? Has Provident Collecting been started with the view of impressing on those, who fall into distress every slack season, the possibility and necessity of looking at life somewhat more as a whole? Are volunteer workers continually being trained in resourcefulness, in thoroughness of work and of purpose, and in experience of the true social forces on which the social worker has to rely? Do the social workers, visitors and philanthropists, all of them know what the life of a first-class workman is, and, therefore, what they want the "poor" to become? These are a few of the directions in which it is the duty of a C. O. S. to promote completeness and definiteness of purpose throughout the mind of its district. Many more will suggest themselves as the work grows and ramifies; for teachers and school managers in particular it can find endless opportunities of usefulness; such as aiding the judgment of parents and children with reference to the entrance upon industrial life. Study in the shape of reading should go hand in hand with the experimental study involved in social work, and the leaders of the C. O. S. should always be ready to point out a line of reading, as well as to supply practical training under experienced workers, with regard to any province of social work which the district calls for; sanitation, for example.

These are imperfect suggestions, made, as was inevitable, without that knowledge of the neighborhood which is the foundation for any sound and definite theory of its possibilities. But I hope that in some degree they may have conveyed an idea

of the spirit, which, as I believe, should animate all social work, or may have contributed to your own reflections some elements out of which better suggestions may spring.

BERNARD BOSANQUET.

OXSHOTT, SURREY, ENGLAND.

THE THEORY OF VALUE AND ITS PLACE IN THE HISTORY OF ETHICS.

IN the larger and historical present, no more vital question is broached than that concerning the ultimate nature of ethical ideas; among English and American thinkers is such especially the case. Teutonic thought with all that is meritorious about it, has never in its history produced any such wealth of discussion as that which has grown out of the endeavor among English-speaking thinkers to adjust the respective claims of Hedonist and Intuitionist. But this dispute, which has so long been current, is to be continued with only meagre satisfaction. The student of modern ethics reads the fervent eloquence of a Martineau and the judicious logic of a Sidgwick half-wishing that such superior efforts might have been expended in some more worthy cause than that of combatting theory with theory, of adjusting claim to claim. Something more fundamental is to-day demanded. The *unum necessarium* of ethical science is some concept whose vitality has not been sapped by mere disputation. In a theory of value such a principle may perhaps be found.

Other sciences than that of ethics have already taken up the theory of value. In economics and theology, in popular thought and systematic speculation this may be observed. So far as economics is concerned, the pertinency of this theory is immediately apparent, as the practical application of the same is specific and technical. But no less vivid is the use made of the valuational idea in the Ritschlian theology. Here, it is systematically applied, filling the breach made by the extraction of speculation from theology. In addition to these particular